



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,453	12/20/2001	Brad Allen Medford	8285/487	4820 .
7590 06/23/2005		EXAMINER		
JOSEPH F. HETZ			REKSTAD, ERICK J	
BRINKS HOFE	ER GILSON & LIONE			
SUITE 3600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
455 N. CITYFRONT PLAZA DR.			2613	
CHICAGO, IL 60611			DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/037,453	MEDFORD ET AL.	MEDFORD ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Erick Rekstad	2613			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence add	ress		
THE - External after - If the - If NC - Failur	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION IN COMM	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r . reply within the statutory minimum of thir riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this contained BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.		
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	4 January 2005.				
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ ²	This action is non-final.				
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar rrection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFf	· ·		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) [a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National S	Stage		
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice 3) Information	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO- 	-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

This is a second non-final rejection for application no. 10/037,453 in response to the amendment filed January 24, 2005 in which claims 1-22.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,335,760 to Sato in view of US Patent 6,778,607 to Zaccarin et al.

[claims 1-3]

As shown in Figure 2, Sato teaches the encoding of an image using discrete cosine transform. Sato further teaches the ability to provide a DCT-encoded signals with different coefficient bits based on the capabilities of the user's display (Col 9 Line 48-Col 10 Line 29). Sato specifically teaches the second (6 bits) and third (4 bits) DCT-encoded signals are less then the first (8 bits) DCT-encoded signal as required by claims 1 and 2. Sato does not specifically teach providing the signals at the same time.

Art Unit: 2613

[claim 6]

As shown in Figures 3 and 4, Zaccarin teaches providing a plurality of encoded video streams. Zaccarin further teaches the use of the plurality of encoded video streams in order to provide different bit-rates for optimal quality for different bandwidths (Col 5 Lines 9-26). Zaccarin further teaches the bit-rates are different (Col 5 Lines 45-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the DCT-encoding method of Sato with the plurality output of Zaccarin in order to provide multiple users with varying capabilities a video signal. [claims 4-5]

As shown above Zaccarin teaches both DCT-encoded signals have different bandwidths and bit-rates (Col 5 Lines 9-16 and 45-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the DCT-encoding method of Sato with the plurality output of Zaccarin in order to provide multiple users with varying capabilities a video signal.

Zaccarin further teaches the signals are substantially synchronized (CoI 5 Lines 32-44, Fig. 4).). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the DCT-encoding method of Sato with the plurality output of Zaccarin in order to provide multiple users with varying capabilities a video signal. [claims 8-13]

Sato does not specifically teach the use of a computer-usable medium having computer program code to direct a computer system to perform the encoding method.

Zaccarin teaches the method stored in a computer readable medium for use by a

general purpose computer (Col 2 Lines 40-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store the method of Sato and Zaccarin on computer readable medium in order to use a general purpose computer to perform the method.

[claims 15-20]

As shown in Figure 1 of Sato and further in figures 2, 3, 5 and 6 of Zaccarin, Sato and Zaccarin teach the system to perform the method of claims 1-6.

[claim 22]

As shown above, Sato teaches the removal of at least one lesser significant bit (Col 9 Lines 51-58 and Col 10 Lines 22-23).

Claims 7, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato and Zaccarin as applied to claims 1, 8, and 15 above, and further in view of US Patent 5,604,494 to Murakami et al.

[claims 7, 14, and 21]

Sato and Zaccarin teach the method and system for producing multiple encoded streams. Sato teaches the use of 8 bits for t. Zaccarin does not specifically teach the number of bits for each stream. Murakami teaches the use of 12, 13 or 14 bits as a common bit number to produce a compression rate of ½ (Col 18 Lines 28-37). It would have been obvious one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use 12, 13 or 14 bits for the bit number of a stream in the system of Sato and Zaccarin in order to produce a compression rate of ½ as taught by Murakami.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2613

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erick Rekstad whose telephone number is 571-272-7338. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Erick Rekstad Examiner AU 2613 (571) 272-7338 erick.rekstad@uspto.gov